Pam-
War
&
peace

2325

CHRISTIANITY
VS.
ORGANIZED PACIFISM

By

Fred R. Marvin

Issued by

THE COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN EDUCATION
598 Madison Avenue New York City

Price, Ten Cents

1936

"What has been undermining the State in different countries? What has led it to disorder? Are only casual mistakes, transgressions and failures of government to be made responsible for it? Is it not rather the applying of erroneous political philosophy? Is it not the obstinate effort to realize political doctrines, that are at variance with the idea of State as well as with human nature? Is it not the compliance with theories, which, since the French Revolution propagated their heresies in Europe, excluding moral law from public life, spreading anarchy and undermining the State?"

Pastoral letter of his Eminence The Cardinal Primate of Poland.

CHRISTIANITY
VS.
ORGANIZED PACIFISM

There are no two words in the English language more generally misused and more universally abused than the words Christianity and pacifism. Literally millions of well-meaning, sincere and conscientious persons have been deceived by those who employ the banners of Christianity and pacifism to conceal their real purpose. The two are linked together in a movement to abolish war. The emotional appeal contained in the words has gained the attention of many who honestly believe that, in giving aid and support to all such movements, they are exhibiting a true Christian spirit.

The desire to abolish war as an instrument for the settlement of differences between nations is noble. There are few people in this world—especially in the United States—who, if they knew that there would never be another war, would not be overjoyed. But there may be a vast difference between an objective and the method adopted to attain that objective.

In the case of the sincere pacifist the objective—the abolition of war—is highly desirable; the method adopted—alignment with open and notorious communist and socialist organizations—is highly menacing. There is no affinity between the true objective of sincere Christian pacifists and persons accepting the theory of communism and socialism. The former are unskilled in the art of trickery; the latter are past-masters in that art; the former being honest accept others on faith; the latter, being dishonest, use the former as mere dupes.

Abolition of War Not Objective

The objective of the communist and the socialist is not to abolish war, but instead to abolish the institution of private property. This institution today is upheld, sustained, and those who exercise their right to own private property are defended by all existing governments, save and except Russia. These governments, for their preservation, maintain certain agencies of defense. These agencies are employed when and if

these nations, for any reason, are forced into a war, the one with another. But these defensive agencies serve a further purpose. They preserve the integrity of their respective governments should any of its citizens, or outside influences, seek to destroy that government by a revolution. Therefore, all forms of national defense are anathema to the communist and socialist, because such defense agencies stand between them and the attainment of their objective, that is, the abolition of the institution of private property.

Anything that weakens these defenses automatically strengthens the position of the socialist and communist and places them a step nearer their goal. By shouting from the house-tops that they are opposed to war they have gained the attention and, unfortunately, the moral support, yes financial aid, of a large number of well-intentioned persons.

To illustrate:

Under the banner of pacifism a parade and demonstration was recently staged in New York City. Similar parades and demonstrations have been held in other cities. This one—as were many of the others—was organized under the direction of the League Against War and Fascism. While, no doubt, many who participated in that parade and demonstration were sincere persons, yet the greater number of the marchers were members of out-and-out communist and socialist organizations. The actual purpose of the demonstration was to gather into the fold as many persons as possible who, because of the ardent advocacy of pacifism, could not see the communist intrigue involved, and who by their presence would give an air of respectability to the communist movement.

Are Speaking Out of Turn

Rev. Dr. Christian F. Reisner, pastor of the Broadway Temple Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City, in his sermon on February 9th, 1936, according to the New York Times of the next morning, accused a " 'small organized group' of speaking for the Methodist Church and usually misrepresenting most of the 8,000,000 members of the churches bearing that name." The Doctor is quoted by the Times as saying,

"And now the leader of this group heads an organization composed supposedly of Christians and Communists under the title of The American League Against War and Fascism. Christians are urged to have tolerance and work together against some 'bogey man' called 'Fascism' which this group affirms is certain to bring oppression and war."

"* * * it is our misfortune that our very moral enthusiasms make us an easy prey for the professional propagandists", writes Bishop Charles Fiske. "That is why we are engaged in the task of outlawing war. We are the victims of paid pacifists who induce us to preach disarmament in season and out and demand the abolition of armies and navies at once, instead of trying out the experiment on a small scale and beginning by discharging the local police force and throwing away the key to the front door." [1]

Who is there who does not wish to see war abolished? Who is there who does not wish to see the people of all nations, all races, all religions, all countries, live together in this world of ours in peace and harmony? But before we undertake to secure that much-to-be-desired result, would it not be well for each of us to survey conditions in a more limited territory?

Would it not be the part of wisdom to begin with our own family? Is there peace and harmony there? If not, would it not be well to engage our time and energies in straightening out the differences that cause these "family spats", before we start out to reform the entire world?

If we find peace and harmony within the sacred precincts of our own home, then let us survey the community in which we live. Is all peace and harmony there? Do all the people and all the families living in that community exhibit the brotherly love we are asking the nations of the earth to exhibit, the one toward the other? If not—and where will you find a community of one hundred persons where perfect peace and harmony does prevail?—then would it not be far better for us to ascertain the cause, or causes, of this discord, and engage our time and attention to making the proper correction, before we enter a field covering the entire globe?

There is no gainsaying the fact that one of the outstanding and most active organizations today engaged in "abolishing war" is, at the same time, demanding the "abolition of fascism." Why link the two together? Would it not be far more consistent to propose the "abolition of war and communism?" Fascists do not urge revolutions in other countries; Communists do. Fascists do not propose to destroy the right of the individual to own property; Communists do. Fascists make no fight against religion and the family; Communists do.

---

[1] "The Confessions of a Puzzled Parson", Scribners, 1928, pages 41-42.

Without questioning the sincerity of a large number of persons who call themselves pacifists, the fact remains that so completely have the subversive forces annexed the movement that, instead of any longer being an honest effort to prevent armed conflicts between nations, it has degenerated into a movement controlled and directed by communist and socialist organizations engaged in intensifying conditions which may result in revolutions in the different countries.

It is safe to say that no honest pacifist wants a revolution in the United States any more than he wants the United States in war with some other nation. He would work just as earnestly to prevent the one as the other, and yet, as matters stand today, unknowingly and unwittingly we naturally assume, many of these ardent souls are advocating the program of the communist-socialist groups designed primarily to bring about a revolution in the United States.

Pacifism of Socialist Origin

Pacifism, as it exists in an organized form today, was conceived in socialist headquarters many years ago. Within four years from the time the first International was formed through the influence of Marx, pacifism, as we now know it, was presented as a step toward the ultimate socialization of the nations of the world. Since the attainment of socialism, in the minds of many who advocate that fallacious theory, can only come through a bloody revolution, pacifism is playing an important part in forcing different nations to weaken their defenses in order that such revolutions may be successful.

In 1889, at a gathering of the Second International the demand was made that "standing armies be abolished. . . . These demands were reaffirmed at Brussels in 1891, at London in 1896 and at Paris in 1900", writes Prof. Harry W. Laidler.[2] At the last named convention the pacifist movement on a world-wide scale was planned. The following resolution was adopted:

"The standing International Socialist Committee shall be instructed to organize uniform movements of protest against militarism"—that is, all forms of national defense—"in all countries at one and the same time, whenever there shall be occasion to do so."[3]

The reason for the adoption of this resolution is made clear by the debates attending its presentation. The delegates obviously were not

[2] "Socialism in Thought and Action", page 249.

[3] Ibid, page 250.

motivated by any humanitarian instinct. The plan was adopted wholly because it was their belief it would advance the socialist program. "War", they held, "is opposed to their highest aims—the creation of an economic order on a socialist basis . . ."[4] One is forced to ask the question, will the leading pacifists of this land admit that their advocacy of the abolition of war is due to their interest in "the creation of an economic order on a socialist basis?"

A Fertile Mental Field Found

The efforts of the socialists, following the injunction of the resolution just cited, to enlist the support of conscientious persons in the pacifist movement in the United States for a number of years was not very successful. They persisted in their effort, however. When we were forced into the World War the organized Socialist Party adopted emphatically disloyal resolutions. This caused a number of their well-intentioned members to withdraw and many of them since have done their part in exposing the entire socialist scheme.

Immediately following the war there was a fairly fertile mental soil for the spread of the socialist brand of pacifism. A bloody revolution had destroyed the old regime in Russia. A socialist government had been set up there, this government to be the god-father and god-mother of similar revolutions in every nation on the face of the globe. It was the belief of the sponsors of the Russian revolution that the same methods could be employed with equal success in the United States, providing, however, our armed forces were first materially weakened and the spirit of defense then exhibited by the people likewise weakened.

Even before the armistice was signed, certain groups were busy with their pacifist demands carrying out the resolution of some twenty years before, to which reference has been made. Those engaged in these efforts were fairly well known socialists, or persons allied, in some form or manner, with the socialist movement. Anyone going beneath the surface of such organizations at that time—and far more pronounced today—will find that the ultimate objective was not the abolition of war, but, instead, the abolition of the right of the individual to acquire and own property.

Today the communists—the left wing of the socialist movement—are more or less in charge of organized pacifism in the United States. They are exceptionally frank in saying that their one aim and purpose is to

[4] Ibid, page 252.

destroy our form of government and establish a soviet form. They are further frank enough to say that if this cannot be done peaceably—and very few of them believe peaceable methods will be effective—they will support an open revolution.

An outstanding authority on the aims and purposes of the communists is a textbook, "The A B C of Communism" by N. Bucharin and E. Preobrazhensky. N. Bucharin, before the Russian revolution, was the editor of a revolutionary paper, the "Novy Mir" in New York City. In that book appears this language:

"We need it (the dictatorship) that we may crush the enemies of the proletariat *by force*. Quite openly we say, by force." [5] ". . . since the main strength of the government resides in the army, if we wish to gain the victory over the bourgeoisie, the first essential is to disorganize and destroy the bourgeois army. . . . We must promote disintegration in an army . . . Failing this, the revolution will succumb. . . . a revolutionist who destroys the State apparatus of the bourgeoisie may consider that he is doing excellent service." [6]

"The proletarian revolution must today be a world revolution. On world lines only can it be developed." [7] "Civil war is an extremely intensified class war, and it occurs when the class war has led to a revolution." [8] "To think that the revolution can take place without a civil war is equivalent to thinking that there can be a 'peaceful' revolution." [9] "Marx was an advocate of the civil war, that is to say of the fight of the armed proletariat against the bourgeoisie." [10]

Urges A Dictatorship

Lenin was a strong advocate of the revolution. He wrote:

"Disarmament is an ideal of socialism. In socialist society there will be no war, therefore disarmament will become an actual fact. But he is not a socialist who expects that socialism will become a reality without a socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Dictatorship is a government resting directly on the use of violence . . ." [11]

---

[5] British edition, page 82.
[6] Ibid, page 84.
[7] Ibid, page 163.
[8] Ibid, page 128.
[9] Ibid, page 129.
[10] Ibid, page 130.
[11] "Lenin's Instructions Concerning Revolution and Dictatorship of the Proletariat", Gosizdat, Moscow-Leningrad, translated from the Russian, page 13.

These citations are illustrative of the type of mind of those who, today, appear in the front ranks of the organized pacifist movement and, by their blandishment, gain the support of many loyal and sincere persons who are honestly opposed to all forms of armed combat. No communist so much as pretends that he is a pacifist; what he insists upon is the weakening of the defensive forces of all so-called capitalist nations while, at the same time, strengthening the defensive forces of Russia, on the assumption that, in this manner, successful revolutions in all such countries will eventuate.

It is a part of communist strategy to bore from within all forms of organizations to capture or destroy them. They have, in effect, captured the organized pacifist movement in the United States, because well-meaning persons intent on finding a way to avoid war of all kinds—and that covers revolutions—have, to a large extent, withdrawn from certain pacifist movements. Oliver Carlson, a member of the executive committee of the American Communist Youths, speaking before a group at Youngstown, Ohio, explained the reason for their boring from within system. He said:

"It is the duty of all communists to seize upon all phases of discontent and develop them into situations where communists can put across their agitation." [12]

The Tactics of the United Front

Can one conceive of a better banner under which to "put across their agitation" than that of pacifism? And when well-meaning persons join with the League Against War and Fascism in a demonstration, do they not prove conclusively that they are being propagandized in favor of the very thing they abhor—a revolution in this country?

Such organizations as the League Against War and Facism—and there are a number of them—operate to perfect what, in communist terminology, is called the "united front." The Fifth Congress of the Communist International, July, 1924, adopted a resolution upon this subject in which the following language appeared:

"The tactics of the united front are nothing else but an offer made by the Communists to wage a common struggle with all the workers belonging to other parties or other groups, or not belonging to any parties at all, in defense of the elementary vital interest of the working class

---

[12] September 25, 1924.

against the bourgeoisie. . . . It goes without saying that the tactics of the united front must be applied differently in the various countries, to suit the concrete circumstance." [13]

"The League Against War and Fascism was originally founded as a World Congress Against War, which convened in its first international meeting at Amsterdam, Holland, August 27-29, 1932", writes Homer L. Chaillaux, Director, National Americanism Commission, of the American Legion. "The idea of this Congress originated in the mind of Henri Barbusse, author and world-known French Communist. Several well known American Communists and left wing radicals representing the United States, attended that Amsterdam meeting. Among them were Ella Reeves Bloor, Michael Gold, Harold Hickerson, and others." [14]

The great mass of the American people by training, inheritance and inclination, are opposed to war. Peace societies have long existed. Those who formed these societies, and those who became members, had no thought of aiding a revolution, or of seeking, in any manner, to subvert the government of the United States. When forced into a war they readily gave their services to their country. Those who have carried this pacifistic sentiment beyond the bounds of reason are now being made the victims of a plot to destroy all of us. They are being victimized because it suits "the concrete circumstances", and aids in the establishment of the "united front" under the guidance of trained communist leaders.

The whole world today is asked to choose between two directly opposite philosophies of life—that enunciated by Jesus, the practical leader, and that presented by Marx, the impractical visionary. The former is based on love, construction; the latter on hatred, destruction. The former advances the individual; the latter destroys his very soul. The former has proven its merit; the latter, where tried, has brought naught but human suffering and general chaos. The former is called Christianity; the latter, both socialism and communism.

There is no affinity between socialism and communism on the one side, and true Christianity upon the other. No well informed socialist or communist holds there is. "Christianity and Socialism stand toward each

---

[13] Pages 109-110.

[14] Mr. Chaillaux, under a "borrowed" name. attended the conference of the League Against War and Fascism held at Cleveland, Ohio, January 3-5, 1936. His report on that meeting is very enlightening. All misled idealists of this nation should secure a copy and read it.

other as fire and water," says Bebel, who has long been one of the patron saints of socialism. In the 1912 platform of the Socialist Party of America, appears this language:

"The ethics of Socialism and religion are directly opposed to each other." [15]

Nor can one separate socialism and communism from organized pacifism as it exists in the United States today; indeed pacifism, as we have pointed out, is of socialist origin and today is under communist direction.

Socialism and Religion Are Opposite

Since Christianity and Socialism "stand toward each other as fire and water", and since "the ethics of Socialism and religion are directly opposed to each other"; and since organized pacifism originated in socialist circles and today is directed in the United States by well trained and clever communist leaders, before those who profess Christianity give aid and support to this character of pacifism, would it not be well for them to turn to the teaching of the Master for guidance?

". . . no Christian minister nor true Christian who professes to follow Christ may advocate pacifism or internationalism, because, not only is there nothing in the recorded words of Jesus Christ to support those theories but there are ample quotations to refute and deny them", writes Howard Taylor Oliver. "The word 'peace', so frequently used by Christ, referred to a state of mind or spirit to be attained by his followers and never, as many Christians now seek to interpret it, as pacifism in a military or national sense. Likewise the 'kingdom of God' and 'kingdom of heaven' which he taught was not an all inclusive, earthly state, but rather a state of being or consciousness." [16]

"Pacifism is as unscriptural as it is illogical . . .", said Dr. T. T. Shields of Toronto, Canada. "Pacifism, religiously, has brought us to a serious pass. Failure to recognize this cardinal principle has reduced the religion of Christ to a little more than a bit of sentimental idealism." [17]

The philosophy of Jesus has persisted for more than two thousand years. No doctrine save one that expresses demonstrable truths, could

---

[15] Citations from "The Fruit of Modernism", Marvin, page 8. See that document for additional citations along the same line.

[16] "An Open Letter", dated Washington, D. C., December 10, 1935.

[17] London Patriot, October 3, 1935.

live that long. Many have misinterpreted it, many have scoffed at it, many have reviled those who sincerely and earnestly have sought to follow the teachings of the Master, but withal the doctrine has grown and grown until its inspirational tenets are known in every civilized nation on the face of the globe. During all these years, time without end, forces have appeared to contest the correctness of the philosophy of Jesus. One after another, these forces fell. Today Christianity—and that means, in the broader sense, civilization—is faced with a better organized enemy than at any time in the past. That enemy is communism, often referred to as bolshevism. Never in the past has there been a foe to Christianity that knew better how to draw within its folds those who professed that faith. This it has done by intrigue, deception and camouflage. And all for a purpose—to make friend destroy friend.

Social Order Must Be Subverted

"Religion was the force considered most dangerous by the Soviet leaders", writes William Chauncey Emhardt. "Religion was the basis of social ideals; and the social order must be abolished or subverted. Divide and attack; or better still, allow adversaries, nominally within the Church, to destroy each other." [18]

Jesus, time and time again, cautioned his followers to "take heed that no man deceive you", declaring that "many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many." [19]

The ultimate objective of socialists and communists, as has been stated but it will bear repetition, is to destroy the right of the individual to acquire and own property. To attain that end they hold it necessary first to capture or destroy those governments which now recognize that right and protect and defend the individual in the exercise thereof. Organized pacifism is a means to this end. Those of this group, while shouting with all their might that they are seeking to prevent wars between nations, stress their program to create a class war within the different nations, expecting the ill-feeling thus engendered to eventuate in bloody revolutions. Soviet Russia, the inspiration for these efforts, while crying for peace, maintains the largest army of any nation upon the face of the globe, and is spending great sums to further enlarge its fighting forces. [20]

---

[18] "Religion in Soviet Russia", page 127.

[19] Matthew, 24: 4-11.

[20] The daily papers for January 14 and 15, 1936, contain dispatches from Moscow to the effect that the communists have just planned to spend nearly three billions of dollars, our money value, for additional armed forces. "Russia's war budget for the coming year is almost three times as large as America's national defense provisions for 1936-7", reads the press story.

After having gained control of so-called capitalist countries, the socialists and communists plan the establishment of a form of government which does not recognize the private property right; one wherein the citizens, instead of being free in their actions, as under our Constitution, are subject to the will of an autocratic group in control of government.

Can anyone reading the Scriptures with understanding find a single utterance of Jesus that expresses His approval of the abolition of the rights of the individual to acquire and own property; or that approves subversive activities on the part of the citizens of any government; or that disapproves of a government protecting itself against enemies?

"His way of approach to the life of His age was not by external organization or mass-movements or force of numbers, or in any way from without", continues Dr. Peabody, "but by interior inspiration, by the quickening of individuals, by the force of personality, or, so to speak, from within." [21]

"It is hopeless to think of founding an enduring democratic State on the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity", wrote Prof. John Rae, the eminent Scottish economist some years ago, "unless these principles are always sustained and reinvigorated by the Divine fraternal love that flows from faith in Jesus Christ." [22]

Reforms Should Start With the Individual

There are, indeed, but few persons bold enough to attempt to refute the logic of Dr. Peabody and Prof. Rae, each viewing the subject from different angles, and from the environments of different countries. Dr. Peabody calls attention to the fact that Jesus was not interested in any form of mass-movements. He dealt with the individual at all times. "He surveys economic problems from above", writes Dr. Peabody, "and perceives that fidelity in the affairs of industry opens the way to the kingdom; he approaches economic problems from within, and finds their key in character [23] . . . "

And where, pray tell, should reformation start, save with the individual? Society is made up of individuals; our government is the product of individuals. If we are to destroy the age-old system of employing

---

[21] "Jesus Christ and the Social Question", Macmillan, page 89. This book, first printed in 1900 and reprinted in 1925 and 1930, is of special interest today and should be carefully read and studied by every earnest Christian.

[22] "Contemporary Socialism", page 236.

[23] "Jesus Christ and the Social Question", page 299.

force to settle differences that may arise between us and some other nation, must we not first create a different spirit in our people; and must not the other country, whatever it may be, create a different spirit in its people? Must not the common desire of all be to adjust these differences through peaceful negotiations? Have we not, as a matter of fact, progressed along this line? Have not we and other nations set up instruments to this end? And so far as we, of the United States are concerned, did we not, more than a decade ago, to show our earnest desire to maintain world peace, destroy warships which had cost us many millions of dollars? And is there any sane person who has given thought and study to world conditions, who can gainsay the statement that, but for the advent of communism, there would be no such thing as a dictator in any country and nothing approaching a war-like spirit would animate any nation?

If World War, Communism Will Be Responsible

The communists formed the first present-day dictatorship. Those of Italy and Germany were later established in order to save these countries from the horrors of bolshevism. Should there come another world war in the near future it will be one waged by the forces of communism upon the one hand to gain world control, and the forces of civilization upon the other to retain for men their individual rights recognized generally by existing governments. Such a war will be of communist inception. The success of the forces of communism means the abolition of Christianity for many years to come; and that means chaos.

To allege that Jesus, the founder of Christianity, for a moment countenanced what is now being presented under the direction of organized pacifism is almost sacrilegious.

Jesus was the maker of men, not a maker of a politically organized society. Right thinking men produce a right thinking society and a right thinking society produces a fair, a just and an enduring government. Jesus said that "the kingdom was to come not by outward force or social organization or apocalyptic dream, but by the progressive sanctification of individual human souls," writes Dr. Peabody. [24]

Jesus did not make war against men, nor yet did he make war against organized society or existing governments. His fight was against the evils which men, society, and organized governments had created because they, and each of them, had violated the simple principle under-

[24] Ibid, page 101.

lying His teachings. And He recognized, as has, apparently, no man since His day, that true reformation comes from within and not from without, and that would-be reformers who seek, through mass action, ballyhoo and propaganda, to overthrow that which they may deem an evil, while seemingly successful for a time, inevitably fail in the final analysis.

We can not bring ourselves to the belief that the thousands of sincere pacifists who, believing that they are taking steps to abolish war when they march under the banners of communists, have any conception of the aims and purpose of communism. Most of them profess to be Christians. If they are true Christians, they should be in the front ranks of the Christian cohorts battling to prevent the advance of a dangerous, destructive, false, anti-religious doctrine. There are things far more horrible than war; bolshevism in the United States, for instance. Many able students of the subject take this position. Sir Ernest Benn, the English writer and publisher, says:

"My case is that by continuing to dally with Bolshevism we are heading straight towards war—and here is an issue which is surely worth the consideration of many people who would seem today deliberately to ignore it." [25]

Atheism, Pure Atheism

Dr. George Wells Arms, pastor of the Bedford Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, after quoting Dr. Robert E. Speer as saying, "There are things worse than war", adds, "Atheistic, blasphemous Russia, denying home, chastity, religion, is worse than war. Anarchy is worse than war." [26]

Communism is atheistic; organized pacifism, being a well defined part of the communist movement, likewise is atheistic. Is it not time true Christians were awakened to what is taking place? Is it not time Christians became militant to retain their religion and so retain the rights and privileges which they possess under our form of government? The destruction of the former means the abolition of the latter.

"In our modern world, the leaders of the Christian Churches have allowed the Church Militant to become a Church Pacifist", reads the first sentence in a circular issued by the Militant Christian Patriots of England. The document continues: "This they have done, some de-

---

[25] "About Russia", page 35.

[26] Reprint from "The Presbyterian," March 14, 1935, page 12.

liberately and others through inactivity; the result is that evil is no longer fought, but even tolerated and allowed to develop unchecked. Since the leaders cannot or will not face the issue, it devolves on the believing layman to do his utmost to fight the forces of evil which are fast disrupting Christian civilisation."

What is true in Great Britain is equally true in the United States.

The practice of pure Christianity which should be the first consideration of every citizen, has become the last. Is it any wonder we have been plunged into the morass of economic despair? Is it any wonder a large number of sincere persons believe that legislative action can set aside established economic laws, or take the place of pure Christian ethics? Is it any wonder that, because of the confused thinking of the people, a whole nation is seeking a way out?

The Way Out

There is a way out. It is a simple one. Return to the practice of sound Christian ethics in this land. Return to the sound thinking of our forefathers. Discard the idealistic theories of the socialistically minded and the destructive philosophy of the communistically minded.

"The American political philosophy underlying the Constitution is based on a belief in God, as shown by the Declaration of Independence, which clearly asserts that governments are instituted among men to secure to them the rights given them by God", reads a statement issued by The American for God Crusade.[27] "America must be told there is no other conceivable basis for the safe-guarding of human liberty than that of a government based on Theism; because unless individual rights are held under the supreme and paramount title of a direct gift from the Creator, they can be taken away by government without the consent of the governed. When the belief in God as the Creator and Ruler of the Universe and as the Giver of human rights is destroyed, might becomes right, the will of the majority or of those temporarily in power becomes the highest law, governments become supreme, despotism becomes effective, human liberties disappear, justice no longer rules and civilization goes backward."

Socialism and communism, the guiding forces of organized pacifism today, openly deny God. They base all governments on force, although

---

[27] 342 Madison Avenue, New York City. The president and organizer, Victoria Booth Demarest, is a member of the celebrated Booth family.

pretending to deprecate force. They subordinate the God-given rights of the individual to the assumed power of the State. They propose to elevate ignorance and destroy intelligence.

Socialism and communism advocate destruction rather than construction. They promote hatred and scoff at love. They tremble lest the people return to the sound teachings of their forefathers, and again place control of their God-given rights in their own hands, for this would result in the destruction of the socialist—communist elaborate and well conceived plan to destroy our form of government, abolish completely the rights of the individual, among them being the right to own property and the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience.

And in their battle to return everything to chaos, the socialist and communist recognize the fact that, although they may be able to deceive skilled diplomats, overcome the fighting forces of opposition, and gain political control in various lands, their ultimate aim can not be attained until they have driven from the hearts and minds of the people the spritual teachings of the Master. Their greatest foe in Russia today is not a suffering, starving population, but instead the firmly intrenched belief in the minds of the passing generation in the righteousness of God.

"We must acquire the direction of education—of church management—of the professorial chair, and of the pulpit. We must bring our opinions into fashion by every art—spread them among the people by the help of young writers. We must preach the warmest concern for humanity, and make people indifferent to all other relations."

"The Illuminati", by Elizabeth Knauss, pages 77-78, taken from "Proofs of a World Conspiracy" by John Robison, 1798.

Others In This Series:

The Fruit of Modernism,

The Fruit of Liberalism,

Christianity, a Practical Business Philosophy

Ten Cents Each